



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,087	09/12/2005	Ning-Ping Chan	QNAT0001P	1993
7590	11/25/2008		EXAMINER	
Leon E Jew 24301 Southland Dr Suite 405 Hayward, CA 94545			YEN, ERIC L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/529,087	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHAN, NING-PING
	<b>Examiner</b> ERIC YEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 July 2008**.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,8,15,22,31,32,41,42 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 8, 15, 22, 31-32, 41-42, 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Office Action mailed 4/25/08, applicant has submitted an amendment filed 7/24/08.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 32, 42, and 49, have been amended. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, 23-30, 33-40, and 43-48 have been cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argues that Petropoulos does not teach a step to screen-scrape a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by the user's pointer, nor a step to calibrate said screen-scraped segment of text into a query according to one or more linguistic and/or grammar rules. (Amendment, page 20).

Before addressing the specifics of applicant's arguments, it is important to note that Petropoulos was not previously applied to teach the entire limitation of the claims. Petropoulos was applied to teach "calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules". King was applied to teach limitations related to screen scraping. Applicant appears to acknowledge this but still argues "the examiner cited above against the present invention's screen-scraping step" (referring to a passage in Petropoulos) ("Amendment, page 21). This characterization is

inaccurate for the reason just mentioned. Specifically, Petropoulos was not applied to teach the screen-scraping portions of the claims.

Applicant appears to be arguing that "calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules" is also not taught by Petropoulos on page 22. To clarify the examiner's rejection, the examiner interpreted the portion selected for preview as the query "calibrated" by a logic rule used to produce the query/preview. The "calibration" was the operation used to generate the preview in response to the mouse-over, and the mouse-overed part of the text is a query because it is used to retrieve the preview information. Under this interpretation, Petropoulos does teach "calibrat[ing] said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules".

Applicant then addresses King. However, applicant argues that King does not teach the calibration step. (Amendment, page 23) As discussed above, the entire limitation was not addressed by either King or Petropoulos. Therefore, this argument is irrelevant for similar reasons. King only teaches the screen-scraping and Petropoulos teaches the calibration under the interpretation described above.

Applicant's final argument is that neither Petropoulos nor King disclose "wherein the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules, wherein said visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer, wherein said visual cue comprises a tail which

approximately overlaps with the user's pointer, and wherein said visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein". These are only general allegations and do not explain why the prior art does not teach the claim limitations.

3. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Therefore, without an explanation of why the prior art does not teach these features, the examiner maintains similar prior art rejections to those previously presented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 8, 15, 42, 49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos (US 7,047,502) in view of King (US 6,934,848), and further in view of Carr (US 5,428,733).

Consider claim 1: Petropoulos discloses a system for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

the system comprising a processor which is configured to:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a visual cue on the user's screen, said visual cue containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas**).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

discloses visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable).

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (see Col. 1, lines 45-55).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (see Col. 1, lines 30-40).

Consider claim 8: Petropoulos discloses a computer usable medium containing instructions in computer readable form for carrying out a process for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an

electronic document displayed in the user's screen (see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page),

said process comprising the steps of: capturing a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area),

calibrating said segment of text into a query (see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules);

translating said query into a second language (see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page);

and displaying a callout on the user's screen, said callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where

**Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable).**

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (see Col. 1, lines 45-55).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (see Col. 1, lines 30-40).

Consider claim 15: Petropoulos discloses a method for providing a user with bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed in the user's screen (see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page),

comprising the steps of: capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area);

calibrating said segment of text into a query according to one or more rules (see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules);

translating said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page);

and displaying an annotation callout on the user's screen, said annotation callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

discloses visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data). It

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (**see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (**see Col. 1, lines 30-40**).

Consider claim 42: Petropoulos discloses a system for providing real-time multilingual annotation service over a global network from a server to a user (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), said system comprising:

(a) a client application which runs on the user' computer, said client application being operable to: capture a segment of text in a first language, said segment of text being adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query; send said query to the server; and display an annotation callout which contains said query and the translation of said query returned from the

server (see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules);

and (b) a server application which runs on the server, said server application being operable to: translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page);

and return the translation of said query to the client application (see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (**see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (**see Col. 1, lines 30-40**).

Consider claim 49: Petropoulos discloses a method for providing real-time multilingual annotation service over a global network from a server to a user (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26, where Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), said method comprising:

capturing a segment of text in a first language, said segment of text being adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrating said screen-scraped segment of text into a query (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

sending said query to the server (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discloses the query travels over the network**);

translating said query at the server into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

returning the translation of said query to the user's computer (**see Col. 11, lines 12-36, where Petropoulos discusses the information is returned to the originating computer**);

and displaying an annotation callout which contains said query, the translation of said query, and/or other reading aid information, returned from the server (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas**).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (**see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable**).

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (see **Col. 1, lines 45-55**).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (see **Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (see **Col. 1, lines 30-40**).

5. Claims 22, 31-32, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petropoulos (US 7,047,502) in view of King (US 6,934,848) as applied to claims 22 and 32 above, and further in view of Litster (US 7,113,904) and further in view of Carr (US 5,428,733).

Consider claim 22: Petropoulos discloses a system for returning to a remote user from a web server a bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in a website supported by the web server(see **Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**),

said system comprising an application which operates to:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (see **Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

Art Unit: 2626

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 4, lines 20 – 45, where Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a visual cue on the user's screen, said visual cue containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

a graphical user interface embedded in each page of said web site (**see Col. 3, lines 32-51, where Petropoulos discusses elements of a GUI in a web site**),

said graphical user interface comprising: means for activation or deactivation of said application (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses mouse-over activation**);

and means for selecting said second language from a list of languages.

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (**see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable**).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (**see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (**see Col. 1, lines 45-55**). application is automatically activated when said second language is selected (**see, e.g., Figure 1-3**).

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas**).

discloses visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose selecting a language from a list, however Litster discloses selecting a language from a list (**see Col. 5, lines 55-67, where Litster discusses a drop-down list of available languages**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use selecting a language from a list as taught by Litster, thus providing dynamic multiple language support, as discussed by Litster (**see Col. 3, lines 1-14**).

Petropoulos and King and Litster do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (**see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche**). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the invention of Petropoulos and King and Litster, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (see **Col. 1, lines 30-40**). Petropoulos, King, and Litster disclose application is automatically activated when said second language is selected (see, e.g., **Figure 1-3**).

Consider claim 31: Petropoulos discloses a graphical user interface further comprises: means for setting parameters of said visual cue (see **Col. 7, lines 25-35**, where **Petropoulos discusses controllable functional attributes**).

Consider claim 32: Petropoulos discloses a method for returning to a remote user from a web server a bilingual annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in a website supported by the web server (see **Col. 5, lines 37-55**, where **Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page and Col. 11, lines 10-26**, where **Petropoulos discusses the query is fielded by another computer on a network**), comprising the steps of:

capture a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's pointer (see **Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19**, where **Petropoulos discusses the mouse pointer navigating over an area**);

calibrate said segment of text into a query according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (see **Col. 4, lines 20 – 45**, where **Petropoulos discusses determining which preview information to display based on rules**);

translate said query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules (**see Col. 5, lines 37-55, where Petropoulos discusses translation of text on a web page**);

and display a callout on the user's screen, said callout containing said query, said query's translation and/or other reading aid information (**see Col. 4, lines 1-19, where Petropoulos discusses an embedded preview window**).

a graphical user interface embedded in each page of said web site (**see Col. 3, lines 32-51, where Petropoulos discusses elements of a GUI in a web site**),

said graphical user interface comprising: means for activation or deactivation of said application (**see Col. 3, line 64 – Col. 4, line 19, where Petropoulos discusses mouse-over activation**);

and means for selecting said second language from a list of languages.

the length of said segment of text is automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules (**see Col. 6, lines 60-67, where Petropoulos discusses two co-located areas**).

visual cue is dynamically associated with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

visual cue approximately overlaps with the user's pointer (**see Col. 8, lines 38-51, where Petropoulos discusses a floating preview window**).

visual cue is adaptive to fit the content therein (see Col. 6, lines 22-29, where Petropoulos discusses the size is adjustable).

Petropoulos does not specifically disclose screen scraping, however King discloses screen scraping (see Col. 10, lines 4-24, where King discusses screen scraping to extract data). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos, and use screen scraping as taught by King, thus eliminating redundancies, as discussed by King (see Col. 1, lines 45-55).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose selecting a language from a list, however Litster discloses selecting a language from a list (see Col. 5, lines 55-67, where Litster discusses a drop-down list of available languages). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use selecting a language from a list as taught by Litster, thus providing dynamic multiple language support, as discussed by Litster (see Col. 3, lines 1-14).

Petropoulos and King do not specifically disclose a tail, however Carr discloses a tail (see Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 45-55, where Carr discusses a balloon tip or cartouche). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Petropoulos and King, and use a tail as taught by Carr, thus positioning the balloons strategically, as discussed by Carr (see Col. 1, lines 30-40).

Petropoulos, King, and Litster disclose application is automatically activated when said second language is selected (see, e.g., Figure 1-3).

Consider claim 41: Petropoulos discloses a graphical user interface further comprises: means for setting parameters of said visual cue (see Col. 7, lines 25-35, where Petropoulos discusses controllable functional attributes).

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC YEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4249. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EY 11/14/08

/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626